

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
WACO DIVISION

SONOS, INC.

\* January 29, 2021

\*

VS.

\* CIVIL ACTION NO. W-20-CV-881

\*

GOOGLE LLC

\*

BEFORE THE HONORABLE ALAN D ALBRIGHT  
DISCOVERY HEARING (via Zoom)

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff:

Jeffrey Lance Johnson, Esq.  
Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP  
609 Main, 40th Floor  
Houston, TX 77002

Clement Seth Roberts, Esq.  
Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe  
405 Howard Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105

Mark D. Siegmund, Esq.  
Law Firm of Walt Fair, PLLC  
1508 N. Valley Mills Drive  
Waco, TX 76710

Alyssa Caridis, Esq.  
Orrick Herrinton & Sutcliffe LLP  
777 South Figueroa St., Suite 3200  
Los Angeles, CA 90017

George I. Lee, Esq.  
Lee Sullivan Shea & Smith LLP  
656 W. Randolph St., Floor 5W  
Chicago, IL 60661

For the Defendant:

Melissa J. Baily, Esq.  
Jordan R. Jaffe, Esq.  
Lindsay M. Cooper, Esq.  
Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan LLP  
50 California Street, 22nd Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94105

1 Paige Arnette Amstutz, Esq.  
2 Stephen Burbank, Esq.  
3 Scott, Douglass & McConnico, LLP  
4 303 Colorado Street, Suite 2400  
5 Austin, TX 78701

6  
7 Court Reporter: Kristie M. Davis, CRR, RMR  
8 PO Box 20994  
9 Waco, Texas 76702-0994  
10 (254) 340-6114  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript  
produced by computer-aided transcription.

04:29 1 (January 29, 2021, 4:29 p.m.)

04:29 2 DEPUTY CLERK: Court calls Waco Case 6:20-CV-881, Sonos,  
04:30 3 Inc. versus Google LLC for a discovery hearing.

04:30 4 THE COURT: If I could hear announcements from the  
04:30 5 counsel, please, starting with plaintiff.

04:30 6 MR. SIEGMUND: Good afternoon, Your Honor. This is Mark  
04:30 7 Siegmund for plaintiff Sonos, Inc. And with me today I have  
04:30 8 Clem Roberts, Alyssa Caridis, Jeffrey Johnson with Orrick. And  
04:30 9 then I also have Mr. George Lee with Lee Sullivan Shea & Smith.

04:30 10 Mr. Roberts will be the main speaker today, Your Honor.

04:30 11 THE COURT: Very good.

04:30 12 MR. ROBERTS: And, Your Honor, this is Mr. -- (audio  
04:30 13 interruption). I apologize. I'm having some problems with my  
04:30 14 camera. I assure you, I dressed up pretty in a suit and  
04:30 15 everything, but I can't get my camera to work.

04:30 16 THE COURT: Believe me, after this week I've had with my  
04:30 17 technology, I'm very sympathetic and empathetic, so that's  
04:30 18 fine.

04:31 19 MS. AMSTUTZ: Good afternoon, Judge Albright. Paige  
04:31 20 Amstutz and Stephen Burbank are here for Google. We're joined  
04:31 21 by our co-counsel at Quinn Emanuel, Melissa Baily, Jordan  
04:31 22 Jaffee and Lindsay Cooper. And also with us is in-house  
04:31 23 counsel for Google, Susan Kim.

04:31 24 Ms. Baily will be addressing the Court today for Google.

04:31 25 THE COURT: Okay. And tell me again who is going to be --

04:31 1 Mr. Siegmund, who's going to be speaking on behalf of the  
04:31 2 plaintiff?

04:31 3 MR. SIEGMUND: Mr. Clem Roberts, Your Honor.

04:31 4 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Very good.

04:31 5 I'm happy to take up whatever issues you'd like for me to.

04:31 6 MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Your Honor. This is Mr. Roberts.

04:31 7 We have moved to amend the complaint to add the '885  
04:31 8 patent to the case. The '885 patent is a continuation of the  
04:31 9 '206 patent which is already asserted in the case, and it also  
04:32 10 has the same specification with the '996 patent which is also  
04:32 11 in the case. So the patent that we're adding is the same  
04:32 12 family as two other patents that are in the case.

04:32 13 THE COURT: Okay.

04:32 14 MR. ROBERTS: As I understand it, Google does not oppose  
04:32 15 in principle our adding a patent to the case, but they have  
04:32 16 asked or made their approval conditional upon extending all of  
04:32 17 the deadlines, including the Markman deadline, for eight weeks.  
04:32 18 And that is really where this dispute lies.

04:32 19 In our view the schedule that we have for claim  
04:32 20 construction ought not to be affected for, I would say, three  
04:32 21 reasons. Reason No. 1: The invalidity contentions that are  
04:32 22 due between now and the time to claim construction under Your  
04:32 23 Honor's rulings are preliminary, and they can be freely  
04:33 24 amended.

04:33 25 And so even if or to the extent Google needs additional

04:33 1 time to complete its search for prior art, there's nothing  
04:33 2 about providing its preliminary invalidity contentions that  
04:33 3 would result in any prejudice to them. We understand and  
04:33 4 expect that they may decide they need additional prior art that  
04:33 5 they're going to add later, but that shouldn't be an issue  
04:33 6 that's prejudicial to them.

04:33 7 THE COURT: Mr. Roberts, tell me when the Markman's  
04:33 8 currently set.

04:33 9 MR. ROBERTS: The Markman is, I believe, currently set for  
04:33 10 June 4th.

04:33 11 THE COURT: And when are -- I'm sorry. When are  
04:33 12 invalidity contentions due?

04:33 13 MR. ROBERTS: So the invalidity contentions are due  
04:33 14 February 5th.

04:33 15 THE COURT: February -- say that again. February 5th?

04:33 16 MR. ROBERTS: February 5. Yes.

04:34 17 THE COURT: Okay.

04:34 18 MR. ROBERTS: And we had proposed to push that out to  
04:34 19 February 19 for the '885 patent. So for this one patent, if  
04:34 20 they need a few additional weeks even to get their preliminary  
04:34 21 contentions together, we had said no problem. We had pushed it  
04:34 22 to February 19th, and that's in the joint chart that we had  
04:34 23 submitted to Your Honor this morning.

04:34 24 THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to put you all -- I'll be  
04:34 25 back in just a few seconds. Is this Hannah's case?

04:34 1 MR. ROBERTS: Yes, sir.

04:34 2 THE COURT: Okay. I'll be back in a few seconds.

04:38 3 (Pause in proceedings.)

04:38 4 THE COURT: Okay. Here's what we're going to do. I know  
04:38 5 everyone would like to argue, but it would just spoil the  
04:38 6 ending. I think I can figure out what I might do.

04:38 7 I'm going to grant the motion to add the '885 patent. I'm  
04:38 8 going to move the Markman until Thursday, July 1st. Whatever  
04:38 9 dates you have currently will shift back accordingly, which  
04:38 10 will give the defendant an additional month on their invalidity  
04:38 11 contentions with respect to the '885. All the other dates will  
04:38 12 shift accordingly.

04:38 13 And you can check with Hannah. We'll get an order out, or  
04:38 14 check with Hannah. I'm not sure whether we'll do it in the  
04:39 15 morning or the afternoon on July 1st. I believe that's a  
04:39 16 Thursday.

04:39 17 MR. ROBERTS: Thank you. This is Mr. Roberts.

04:39 18 THE COURT: Does that take care of it, Mr. Roberts?

04:39 19 MR. ROBERTS: It does.

04:39 20 The only other thing I'd raise, Your Honor, is two things  
04:39 21 for your -- so you know. We gave Google notice last night that  
04:39 22 we're going to be dropping the '460 patent from the case as  
04:39 23 well. So we're going to remove one patent from the case.  
04:39 24 And --

04:39 25 THE COURT: And they're opposing it, right?

04:39 1 MR. ROBERTS: They're not opposing us removing that  
04:39 2 patent, I don't think.

04:39 3 (Laughter.)

04:39 4 THE COURT: I was kidding. Go ahead.

04:39 5 MR. ROBERTS: And the other thing, Your Honor, is Google's  
04:39 6 filed a motion to stay all of the proceedings, everything  
04:39 7 pending the decision on their motion to transfer. We haven't  
04:39 8 briefed that yet, but if Your Honor had a view about that and  
04:39 9 wanted to give us an indication of whether we would need to  
04:39 10 brief that, we'd be happy to brief it if you feel you need  
04:39 11 briefing.

04:39 12 THE COURT: No. You don't need to brief that. You can --  
04:40 13 I'm going to deny it. However, again -- gosh, I wonder how  
04:40 14 many times I can be mandamus'd in one year. But if you all  
04:40 15 would be kind enough to -- is the briefing done on the motion  
04:40 16 to transfer?

04:40 17 MR. ROBERTS: No. It's not, Your Honor. We served  
04:40 18 discovery on them pursuant to your new ground rules, and they  
04:40 19 have not yet responded.

04:40 20 THE COURT: Okay. Let's do this, because sometimes I  
04:40 21 don't even know things are ripe, and people are unhappy that I  
04:40 22 haven't ruled on them. As a general rule, what I try -- the  
04:40 23 way we're set up -- and my two favorite law clerks are on this  
04:40 24 call on either side, so I'm sure they've advised you of this  
04:40 25 anyway. But the way we -- what we try and accomplish in every

04:40 1 case is getting the motion ruled on in advance of the Markman,  
04:40 2 which I think is the first substantive issue that would require  
04:41 3 me to have jurisdiction for.

04:41 4 And so here what I would recommend that you all do -- let  
04:41 5 me see. It's the defendant's motion to transfer.

04:41 6 Ms. Amstutz, as soon as the motion is ripe for  
04:41 7 consideration, motion, response, reply, as soon as you all have  
04:41 8 filed your reply, let Hannah know and we will set a hearing on  
04:41 9 it. It won't be immediately, but we will get a hearing set on  
04:41 10 it. And it sounds to me like it will all be done -- especially  
04:41 11 since I've moved the Markman back, I will -- I just need to  
04:41 12 have the hearing in advance of July 1st, but we will rule on  
04:41 13 the motion before we have the hearing.

04:41 14 Obviously if we keep it, we'll have the Markman. If we  
04:41 15 don't keep it, we won't have a Markman. But just let us  
04:42 16 know -- Google should let us know through their counsel when  
04:42 17 it's ripe, and then Hannah can set a hearing for us.

04:42 18 MR. ROBERTS: Okay, Your Honor. Thank you.

04:42 19 MS. AMSTUTZ: Thank you.

04:42 20 THE COURT: You bet. July 1st is probably in the window  
04:42 21 where I don't know what we'll be doing in terms of live  
04:42 22 hearings and not -- could everyone mute? I can hear someone  
04:42 23 and I'm having -- we will be transitioning back to having at  
04:42 24 least some live hearings, hopefully by July 1st.

04:42 25 And also in my courtroom now where I may start having more

04:42 1 Markmans in Waco, for this reason we will be able to have them  
04:42 2 live in court and also be able to use Zoom so that clients and  
04:42 3 other people can attend. So we may have the best of both  
04:42 4 worlds.

04:43 5 And so as we get closer, I would say late May, early June,  
04:43 6 whoever it is that's communicating with Hannah ought to help --  
04:43 7 ought to remind us we need to figure out where -- whether the  
04:43 8 Markman will be in person or not.

04:43 9 I'm actually happy, if the lawyers are happy, to do it by  
04:43 10 Zoom. You know, I did 50 Zoom Markmans last year and I thought  
04:43 11 they went great. I thought they went great in part because all  
04:43 12 the clients could attend without having to travel. The lawyers  
04:43 13 could attend without having to travel. And the very best thing  
04:43 14 was, you could allow some younger -- well, everyone on this  
04:43 15 call is younger than me, but less experienced lawyers to get to  
04:43 16 argue things without them having to travel to Austin or Waco to  
04:43 17 do it, which I thought was a good thing as well.

04:43 18 So if the parties in this case decide a Zoom hearing is  
04:43 19 fine, it's certainly fine with me. With the preliminary  
04:43 20 constructions, I don't think I've had any problem being able to  
04:44 21 understand, you know, arguments and stuff. And I've gotten  
04:44 22 pretty comfortable with them.

04:44 23 But if you'd rather do it in person, and we're doing  
04:44 24 things in person in July and people can travel and all that,  
04:44 25 which I don't know about now, let us know and we can take it up

04:44 1 early June.

04:44 2 I'll start with Mr. Siegmund. Is there anything else we  
04:44 3 need to take up on behalf of the plaintiff?

04:44 4 MR. SIEGMUND: No, sir. I think that covers it, and have  
04:44 5 a good weekend, Judge.

04:44 6 THE COURT: You bet.

04:44 7 And I feel bad if I didn't give equal dignity.

04:44 8 Mr. Burbank, is there anything else that we need to do on  
04:44 9 behalf of Google? This is your chance to talk. Don't blow it.

04:44 10 MR. BURBANK: I don't think so, Your Honor, but I'll let  
04:44 11 Ms. Baily jump in.

04:44 12 THE COURT: I think someone else may have been trying to  
04:44 13 tell me yes. So I'm happy to hear it.

04:44 14 MS. BAILY: Your Honor, this is Melissa Baily for Google.  
04:44 15 I heard everything you said and I appreciate it. I'm just  
04:45 16 flagging for the Court that I would have to look at it more  
04:45 17 closely. Based on the schedule as you articulated it for the  
04:45 18 Markman hearing and as I understand the venue dispute schedule  
04:45 19 to play out, it may be difficult under that schedule to get  
04:45 20 venue done first.

04:45 21 And just so you know, in our motion it wasn't just a  
04:45 22 motion to stay, it also had some alternative proposals for  
04:45 23 being able to get venue done quickly and ahead of Markman. So  
04:45 24 I heard everything you said. I just need to look at it more  
04:45 25 closely. And I just wanted to flag for you that, you know,

04:45 1 we'll make it work as best we can to get venue teed up for you  
04:45 2 before Markman.

04:45 3 THE COURT: Well, if you have any problem -- I'm going  
04:45 4 to -- what I'm going to do at the moment is, which I don't very  
04:45 5 often really do, is punt this back to you all, to tell you my  
04:45 6 preference would be to -- strong preference would be to handle  
04:46 7 the motion to transfer in advance. I think that's what's best.

04:46 8 If Google can -- and I'm putting this on you only because  
04:46 9 my guess is the issues are the plaintiff's going to want  
04:46 10 discovery, and how we get the discovery done in advance of how  
04:46 11 the -- and so I'm not picking on Google. I'm just  
04:46 12 acknowledging the reality of the way this works. If Google  
04:46 13 can, for lack of a better word, cooperate, or whatever you want  
04:46 14 to use, and get to the plaintiffs as quickly as possible  
04:46 15 whatever information that the plaintiff thinks they need for  
04:46 16 this motion, that's one way of accomplishing it. But I'm not  
04:46 17 saying Google has to do anything other than what they think is  
04:46 18 appropriate.

04:46 19 If the plaintiff feels like there's information from  
04:46 20 Google they want that Google feels is inappropriate, that's why  
04:46 21 I'm here. I'm happy to hear that as well.

04:47 22 But what I'm going to do is punt this for a little while  
04:47 23 and see how you all are able to deal with getting whatever  
04:47 24 discovery the plaintiff thinks it needs to the discovery  
04:47 25 quickly enough that they can file the motion quickly enough so

04:47 1 that I can hear the motion in advance of the Markman. If you  
04:47 2 all need my intervention, if you all -- by you all, I mean  
04:47 3 either party or both -- feel like you need my intervention to  
04:47 4 help make that happen or for me to push back the Markman, I'm  
04:47 5 happy to do that.

04:47 6 MS. BAILY: Your Honor, I appreciate that. I think even  
04:47 7 if we were to, you know, get everything resolved in a  
04:47 8 cooperative way, just the normal rules, I think, would make it  
04:47 9 hard for us to get venue done first, even if there were no  
04:47 10 issues. So I heard what you said and we'll do the best we can  
04:47 11 and come back to you if we think that it's not going to play  
04:47 12 out that way.

04:47 13 THE COURT: And if I need to shorten the times for  
04:48 14 response and reply, I'm happy to do that as well. In other  
04:48 15 words, I try to be as lawyer-friendly as possible. And I've  
04:48 16 done just about -- everything that you all are doing, I've done  
04:48 17 on both sides. So I appreciate -- and I've had cases where,  
04:48 18 you know, the judge didn't get to the motion to transfer in  
04:48 19 time, and I understand why it's frustrating. So I want to be  
04:48 20 sympathetic to that and try and get that resolved as well.

04:48 21 MS. BAILY: Thank you, Your Honor.

04:48 22 THE COURT: So I am -- I'll make myself as available as  
04:48 23 you all need me to to help out, if you see that's what needs  
04:48 24 happen.

04:48 25 MS. BAILY: Thank you, Your Honor.

04:48 1 THE COURT: But I still want to give Mr. Burbank the last  
04:48 2 chance to chat, because...

04:48 3 MR. BURBANK: I think that's all for defendant, Your  
04:48 4 Honor. Unless Paige disagrees, I think we're good.

04:49 5 THE COURT: Very good. Thank you all. I hope you have a  
04:49 6 wonderful weekend, and I hope I see those of you who live near  
04:49 7 me in the near future. Take care.

04:49 8 (Hearing adjourned at 4:49 p.m.)

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT )  
2 WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS )  
3

4 I, Kristie M. Davis, Official Court Reporter for the  
5 United States District Court, Western District of Texas, do  
6 certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the  
7 record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

8 I certify that the transcript fees and format comply with  
9 those prescribed by the Court and Judicial Conference of the  
10 United States.

11 Certified to by me this 8th day of February 2021.

12  
13 /s/ Kristie M. Davis  
14 KRISTIE M. DAVIS  
15 Official Court Reporter  
16 800 Franklin Avenue  
17 Waco, Texas 76701  
18 (254) 340-6114  
19 kmdaviscsr@yahoo.com  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25